

Remarks

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Official Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 are now in the application, with Claim 1 being independent. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9 and 11 have been amended herein. Claim 13 has been added herein.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicants have reworded the language questioned by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph, rejection are requested.

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,892,317 (Mukohjima et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As is recited in independent Claim 1, the present invention relates to a vibration type driving apparatus, including a vibration body and a contact body. The vibration body generates vibration by supplying a driving signal to an electro-mechanical energy converting element. The contact body contacts the vibration body and is moved by vibration received from the vibration body. The vibration body includes a base portion having the electro-mechanical energy converting element and a plurality of vibration amplification portions for amplifying vibration generated at the base portion. Neighboring

vibration amplification portions are connected at a position different from a connecting position of each vibration amplification portion with the base portion.

Mukohjima et al. relates to a vibration wave motor including an elastic member 2 having projections 2A. In the Office Action, it is suggested that these projections 2A are connected at the base of elastic member 2. However, it cannot be said that adjacent projections 2A in Mukohjima et al., assuming they can be considered neighboring vibration amplification portions, are connected at a position different from a connecting portion of each vibration amplification portion with the base portion, as is recited in independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, Mukohjima et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in independent Claim 1.

Thus, independent Claim 1 is patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claim 1. Dependent Claims 2-13 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in independent Claim 1. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

MJD:MAW:eyw

DC_MAIN 223660v1